

REMARKS

At the time of the Second Office Action dated February 7, 2007, claims 1-12 were pending and rejected in this application.

Applicants have amended claim 1, 3-6, and 8-11 and cancelled claims 7 and 12 to remove these claims from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of present Application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

CLAIMS 1-12 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED UPON POLONSKY ET AL., U.S. PATENT NO. 7,072,984 (HEREINAFTER POLONSKY), IN VIEW OF BICKMORE ET AL., U.S. PATENT NO. 6,857,102 (HEREINAFTER BICKMORE), AND LEDUC, U.S. PATENT NO. 6,675,351

On pages 6 and 7 of the Decision on Appeal, the Honorable Board made the following findings:

As set forth above, Polonsky discloses a display containing a series of elements that may be selected by a user and displayed on a small-screen device (FF 4-5). Further selection of an element on the display of the small screen device generates a display containing further details associated with the selected element (FF 5). Since a “range” of rows (i.e., data) includes any series or sequence of values within limits (FF 6-7), we find no distinction between this range of data elements (i.e., “rows”) of Polonsky and the claimed “row range views.”

As noted on page 2 of the Appeal Brief, "[a] plurality of row range views is illustrated in Figure 3A" of Applicants' disclosure. Reference is also made to page 9, lines 11-15 of Applicants' disclosure, which states:

Specifically, in FIG. 3A, initially the complex table view can be reduced to an index view of row ranges which can be viewed by the end user. Each row range can be selected by the end user to indicate that the end user would prefer to view those rows within the range, while excluding from view all other rows.

Upon comparing what is illustrated in Fig. 3A of Applicants' disclosure to Figs. 1-12 of Polonsky, despite the findings of the Honorable Board, Applicants are still unable to identify where the claimed "row range view" is identically disclosed. Of Figs. 1-12 of Polonsky, only Fig. 12 is an actual "view," as Figs. 1-11 are either schematic diagrams or flow diagrams. However, Fig. 12 does not identically disclose anything comparable to the row range view illustrated in Fig. 3A of Applicants' disclosure.

Based upon this inconsistency the row range view illustrated in Fig. 3A of Applicants' disclosure and the teachings of Polonsky, Applicants conclude that both the Examiner and the Honorable Board has interpreted the phrase "row range view" broader than that was originally intended by Applicants. Therefore, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 3, and 8 to clarify the claimed limitations.

As claimed, a row range view includes a list of a plurality of ranges of rows. Additionally, markup is delivered for displaying the row range view, in a highly constrained

device, responsive to a request to render the complex table. Thus, the row range view is a list (i.e., a list includes multiple entries) and each entry in the list is a range of rows. For example, referring to Fig. 3A of Applicants' disclosure, one "range of rows" in the list is "Rows [1] ... [4]" and another "range of rows" in the list is "Rows [9] ... [12]." Moreover, the row range view (which includes the list of the ranges of rows) is found in markup, which is used to display the row range view.

Turning back to the Honorable Board's analysis, it appears that the Honorable Board previously construed the term "range or rows" to be "any series or sequence of values within limits." Since the Polonsky teaches rows, the Honorable Board appears to have concluded that these rows inherently have a range (i.e., are found within limits) and, therefore, meet the claimed limitations. These claim construction and these findings, however, cannot be made with the present claims. As claimed, each entry in the list is not a row (i.e., comparable to the rows within Polonsky). Instead, each entry in the list to be displayed is a range – a teaching of which is not found within Polonsky, Bickmore, and Leduc, either alone or in combination.

For above-described reasons, the Applicants respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Polonsky in view of Bickmore and Leduc.

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Although Applicants believe that all claims are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is directed to the following statement found in M.P.E.P. § 706(II):

When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and the applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, but the claims in their present form cannot be allowed because of defects in form or omission of a limitation, the examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible should offer a definite suggestion for correction. (emphasis added)

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: April 16, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/

Scott D. Paul

Registration No. 42,984

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

Phone: (561) 922-3845

CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320